

Section M

Part IV -- Evaluation Factors for Award

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
M.1 Introduction.....	M-2
M.2 Basis for Award.....	M-2
M.3 Evaluation Factors.....	M-3
M.4 Relative Order of Importance.....	M-5
M.5 FAR 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options (Jul 1990).....	M-5

M.1 Introduction

The instructions set forth in Section L, *Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents*, are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that will be evaluated by the Source Evaluation Board (SEB). The Offeror must furnish adequate and specific information in its response.

DOE intends to evaluate proposals and award a Contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms. DOE reserves the right to conduct discussions, if the Contracting Officer later determines it is necessary.

Any exceptions or deviations to the terms and conditions of the solicitation may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions.

DOE will solicit past performance information from available sources, including references and clients identified by the Offeror, and will consider such information in its evaluation. DOE may obtain relevant past performance information from available Federal Government electronic databases or readily available Government records including pertinent DOE prime contracts. DOE will review all information submitted, may contact some or all of the Contract references provided by the Offeror, and may contact references other than those identified by the Offeror.

M.2 Basis for Award

DOE intends to award one Contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria below.

Technical Proposals will be evaluated against the criteria set forth in Section M.3, *Evaluation Factors*, and will be point scored and rated. The *Technical and Management Proposal* is of significantly greater importance than the *Cost/Fee Considerations Proposal*.

The *Cost/Fee Considerations Proposal* will not be point scored. The Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical and management features than with making an award at the lowest cost to the Government. However, the Government will not make an award at a cost and fee amount that is considered disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of the *Technical and Management Proposal*. To the extent that Offerors' technical and management proposals are evaluated as close or similar in merit, the evaluated price is more likely to be a determining factor for award. The *Cost/Fee Considerations Proposal* (Volume III) should address both the contract base period and the option years.

Prior to any award, a Finding shall be made by the Source Selection Authority of whether possible Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and/or Foreign Ownership, Control, or Influence (FOCI) exist with respect to a particular Offeror, or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflicts exist. An award will be made only if there is no OCI or FOCI or, if either does exist, that it is appropriately avoided or mitigated.

M.3 Evaluation Factors

The following evaluation factors will be used to evaluate offers:

1. experience,
2. medical approach,
3. past performance,
4. organization, controls and systems,
5. small business,
6. transition plan, and
7. cost/fee.

a. *Technical and Management Proposal Criteria*

1. Experience:

The offer will be evaluated on the extent and relevance of the Offeror's corporate experience and the experience of the key personnel in providing occupational medical services that demonstrate effective management of worker health and treatment of illness and injury, specifically in regard to experience with industrial, construction, environmental cleanup, analytical laboratory, and research laboratory settings where exposures and hazards are associated with such environments, including hazardous/toxic waste, biological agents, beryllium, and radioactive materials including forms of uranium, plutonium, and other transuranic materials.

DOE will evaluate each Offeror's key personnel through review of written resumés. In addition to the resumés, references may be contacted in order to assess the education, experience, and demonstrated past performance of the Key Personnel, as well as their suitability to the proposed position, leadership and capability to perform the Statement of Work relevant to their proposed position. Also, the letters of commitment for the proposed Key Personnel shall be evaluated. Failure to submit letters of commitment for the Principal Contract Manager and Site Medical Director positions may result in an adverse impact on the technical evaluation of the Offeror's proposal.

2. Medical approach:

The offer will be evaluated on the degree to which the Offeror's proposed medical approach, organization, business, management, and quality assurance practices (including the self-assessment process), can provide safe, high-quality, efficient, and timely delivery of the required occupational medical services; achieve timely accreditation; perform health studies; and conduct worksite physician visits.

3. Past performance:

The Offeror will be evaluated on the quality of its corporate and key personnel performance under existing and prior contracts regarding the execution of work similar in type, scope and complexity, to the Section C, *Statement of Work*. For example, the following elements of past performance will be evaluated:

- adherence to delivery schedules/response times,
- accuracy of cost estimates and budgets,

- effective use of a medical program management system that included planning, budgeting, status tracking, reporting, baseline management, and records management,
- effective, high-quality execution of the Statement of Work,
- effective subcontract management,
- effective contract transition(s) from previous contractor(s),
- effective support from the contractor's corporate office (if applicable),
- implementation of an effective quality assurance program,
- establishment of effective working relationships with community groups and other stakeholders,
- effective small business participation program and meeting the contractor's small business subcontracting goals/targets.

4. Organization, Controls and Systems:

DOE will evaluate the proposed management systems, controls, and organization. The Offeror's effectiveness in building a project team, optimizing and measuring contract performance, providing support to budget formulation and execution, cost savings initiatives, and maintaining effective working relationships with its Hanford customers (other Primes and DOE) and the public, will be evaluated.

5. Small business:

The offer will be evaluated on the extent to which small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, women-owned business, and veteran-owned business concerns are included in the Offeror's proposed plan to accomplish the solicitation Section C, *Statement of Work*, including protégés under mentor-protégé agreements, both in terms of overall share of the work and the variety and complexity of the work to be performed. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's past performance in meeting subcontracting targets, as well as the subcontracting targets proposed by the Offeror in response to this solicitation.

6. Transition plan:

The offer will be evaluated on the degree to which the Offeror's proposed transition plan can achieve efficient, safe, orderly, and timely transition to the delivery of required occupational medical services on October 1, 2003.

b. *Cost/Fee Considerations* Criterion

The offer will be evaluated to determine the reasonableness of the proposed cost/price, to determine the offeror's understanding of the work and ability to perform the work. Specifically, proposed staffing levels (full-time equivalents - FTEs), hourly wage rates, travel and relocation costs and fee will be evaluated. The cost/fee aspects of the proposal will be considered in the overall evaluation of proposals in the trade-off process to select the best value to the Government.

M.4 Relative Order of Importance

The relative importance of the *Technical and Management* criteria in Section M.4 are as follows:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Weighting</u>
1. Experience	Highest
2. Medical approach	Highest
3. Past performance	High
4. Organization, Controls and Systems	Moderate
5. Small business	Moderate
6. Transition plan	Low

The cost/fee criterion is not weighted per sé, but will be used to evaluate the relative value of each offer, once an evaluation of the technical and management merits of each offer is conducted.

M.5 FAR 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options (July 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).